

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending.

Claims 1-16 stand rejected.

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, and 11-16 have been amended.

Claims 3, 10, and 17-20 have been canceled. Claims 17-20 have been cancelled because they have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner as directed to an invention that is “independent or distinct” from the invention of Claims 1-16.

Claims 21-27 have been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 4-8 and 11-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,151,643 issued to Cheng et al. (hereinafter “*Cheng*”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

For completeness, Applicants will address the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4-8 and 11-15 in view of *Cheng* in combination with U.S. Patent No. 6,367,075 issued to Kruger et al. (hereinafter “*Kruger*”)

Cheng relates to a:

A system and method [to] update client computers of various end users with software updates for software products installed on the client computers, the software products manufactured (sic) by diverse, unrelated software vendors. The system includes a service provider computer system, a number of client computers and software vendor computer systems communicating on a common network. The service provider computer system stores in an update database information about the software updates of the diverse software vendors, identifying the software products for which software updates are available, their location on the network at the various software vendor computer systems, information for identifying in the client computers the software products stored thereon, and information for determining for such products, which have software updates available. ... Changes to the client computer during installation are monitored and archived, allowing the updates to be subsequently removed by the user. *Cheng*, Abstract.

Kruger relates to a “computer program product and apparatus [that] builds a set of uninstall instructions from a set of installation instructions so that one or more installations of computer updates can be removed.” *Kruger*, Abstract.

Thus, both *Cheng* and *Kruger* relate to changing a computer system from one configuration state to a second configuration state by changing the software present in the computer system.

Claim 1.

In contrast to the combined teachings of *Cheng* and *Kruger*, Claim 1 distinguishes between a “configuration state” and a “context state”. In Claim 1, each component in a configuration has “an associated context”. Claim 1 requires:

caching a current first context state in response to a requirement for the installation of a first component, wherein the first component is one of the plurality of components;

changing the current state of the context to a context state corresponding to the context associated with the first component if the current first context state and the context associated with the first component are not equal;

installing the first component as part of the configuration;

upon installing the first component as part of the configuration, **changing a first state of the configuration to a second configuration state that includes the first component;** and

restoring the cached first context state upon completing installation of the first component **without changing the second configuration state.**

Thus, unlike the teachings of *Cheng* and *Kruger*, Claim 1 distinguishes between a “configuration state” and a “context state”. In light of the distinction between “configuration state” and “context state” present in amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the *Cheng* and *Kruger* teachings cited by the Examiner can be fairly construed as modifying

and/or restoring a 'configuration state' and not "caching", "changing", and "restoring" a "context state".

Furthermore, in both *Cheng* and *Kruger*, a computer begins in a configuration state and software is installed to create a second configuration state. If the installed software is uninstalled, the computer either returns to the first configuration state, or if only some software is uninstalled, the computer system moves to a third configuration state. Neither *Cheng* nor *Kruger* teach or suggest "**restoring the cached first context state** upon completing installation of the first component **without changing the second configuration state.**" Claim 1.

Distinguishing between "context states" and "configuration states" is non-trivial. In one embodiment, when configuring heterogeneous subsystems, using the "context state" of the component being installed in a configuration allows a configuration engine to generate a configuration in view of only the components in the context of the installed part rather than in view of all components for the entire heterogeneous system. Once the component is installed, the configuration state changes to include the installed component. The cached context state can then be restored to allow the configuration engine to continue generation of the configuration from the context state present before the component was installed. Although the context state has now been restored, the new configuration state is not changed by restoration of a previous, cached context state.

Claim 2.

For reasons similar to Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that neither *Cheng* nor *Kruger* teach or suggest the present invention of Claim 2.

a cache configured to hold a current first context state in response to a requirement for the installation of a first component, wherein the first component is one of a plurality of components each having an associated context, said associated context state equal to one or more of a plurality of values;

a change module adapted to **change the current first context state to a context state corresponding to the context associated with the first component**

if the current first context state and the context associated with the first component are not equal;

an install module adapted to **install the first component as part of the configuration;**

a module to **change a first state of the configuration to a second configuration state that includes the first component** upon installation of the first component as part of the configuration; and

a restore module adapted to **restore the cached first context state** upon a completion of an installation of the first component **without changing the second configuration state.**

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 2 are allowable. Applicants also respectfully submit that claims directly or indirectly dependent upon claim 1 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Applicants also respectfully submit that claims directly or indirectly dependent upon claim 2 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 2.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng as applied to claims 1 and 2 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,367,075 issued to Kruger et al. (hereinafter "*Kruger*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 3 and 10 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 9 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng as applied to claims 1 and 2 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,721,824 issued to Taylor (hereinafter "*Taylor*") in view of Kruger. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 9 is allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 16 is allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 2.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on January 26, 2006.



Attorney for Applicant(s)

1-26-2006

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Kent B. Chambers
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 38,839